

**PROPOSED AGENDA
SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
NATA REVIEW PANEL**

Public Working Session Conference Call Meeting
Convened in Ariel Rios Building Rm 6013
11:00 am - 1:00 pm Wednesday, June 13, 2001
(Eastern Standard Time)

I. Opening (5 min.)

Dr. Mitchell Small
Panel Chair

- A. Introductions
- B. Overview of Progress Since 5/25 Conference Call

II. Overview/Status of Edits/Changes to NATA Working Draft Report

Dr. Mitchell Small
Panel Chair and NATA Panelists

- A. Highlights and Status of Changes/Edits in 5/23 Draft
(Draft #5) Into the June 6th Public Draft
- B. Letter to the Administrator (2 to 3 pages max.)
- C. Executive Summary and Clarity of Basic Messages
- D. Format for Responses to Charge Questions 1 thru 9 and Remaining Work Needed
 - 1) Format of Questions with specific Recommendations are now Throughout Report
 - 2) Other Recommendations to Consider for Revising the First Public Draft
- E. Appendices, Glossary, Abstract and Other Enhancements
- F. Are the Reference Citations Complete?

III. Panel Overview Discussion of Recommended Edits (whatever it takes):

NATA Panelists

- A. Points of clarification and specific recommendations for edits
- B. Report Charge Discussion & Edits:
 - Question #1 - National Toxics Inventory:** Have the emissions data been appropriately adapted? Suggested improvements for the future (Chien & Gentile). - **Gentile** is Lead Discussant
 - Question #2 - Model Issues:** ASPEN & HAPEM Models and appropriateness of approach taken for concentration generation and comparisons between ambient predictions and monitoring (Gentile, Georgopoulos and Middleton). - **Georgopoulos** is Lead Discussant
 - Question #3 - Dose-Response Information:** Appropriateness of use of dose-response information in the assessment, and suggestions for improvements (Bartell & Brown). **Brown** is Lead Discussant

III. Panel Overview Discussion of Recommended Edits (continued):

NATA Panelists

B. Report Charge Discussion & Edits: (Continued):

Question #4 - Risk Characterization: Strengths and weaknesses of the overall conceptual approach to risk characterization, and suggestions on specific ways it could be improved (Greer, Henry and Liu). - **Henry** is Lead Discussant

Question #5 - Diesel Emissions: risk characterization and suggestions that would improve upon the approach to compare toxic health effects of diesel particulates with other pollutants (Mauderly & Small). **Mauderly** is Lead Discussant.

Question #6 - Uncertainty and Variability: Ways to improve this preliminary assessment, make it more transparent, or integrated more effectively into risk characterization, and methods to quantify across air toxics (Milford & Small). **Milford** is Lead Discussant

Question #7 - Communication: have the results of the assessment been appropriately and clearly presented? Suggested alternative methods or formats that could improve the presentation and communication of these results? (Anderson, Small). **Anderson** is Lead Discussant

Question #8 - Benefits Analysis: Basis for a Benefits Assessment: Applicability to the CAAA Section 812 Study (Everyone. Middleton's notes).- **Middleton** is Lead Discussant

Question #9 - Future Research Priorities: Suggestions for research priorities that would improve future air toxics assessments. (Everyone) (Suggestions by Henry, Greer and Liu)

References Section 4: (Everyone.)

Appendix A: The SAB Process (Jack K.)

Other Appendices: (NATA Panelists)

Glossary: (Jack K.)

Other: Open Discussion (Everyone)

IV. Public Comments (15 minutes)

The Interested Public

[3 minutes max./ per Commenter. Comments should focus on the following three (3) items: 1) Has the NATA Review Panel adequately responded to the questions posed in the charge?; 2) Are any statements or responses made in the draft unclear?; and, 3) Are there any technical errors? Comments should not be duplicative of previously accepted comments.]

V. Summary (10 min.)

Dr. Small

- A. What the NATA Panelists will provide in preparation of the next Consensus Draft
- B. Process, schedule and deliverables to prepare the revised Public Draft: Expectations in preparation for the upcoming Executive Committee review
- D. Feedback from the NATA review Panel and the public regarding the Utility of Posting the June 6th public draft as a PDF file with page numbers and line numbers on the SAB website (www.epa.gov/sab)
- E. Plan and schedule to forward revised consensus draft to the SAB's Executive Committee (Another Conf. Call? Date?)

ADJOURN: 12:00 noon(later if necessary).